	J9B3PADS Sentence	1 med 10/03/19 1 age 1 01 43
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2	X	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
4	V.	18 CR 454 (KPF)
5	JONATHAN PADILLA,	
6	Defendant.	
7	x	
8		New York, N.Y. September 11, 2019 3:30 p.m.
10		C C C F C
11	Before: HON. KATHERINE POLK FAILLA,	
12		
13		District Judge
14	ADDEADANCEC	
15	APPEARANCES	
16	GEOFFREY S. BERMAN United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York	
17	FRANK J. BALSAMELLO Assistant United States Attorney	
18	JAMES E. NEUMAN	
19	Attorney for Defendant	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 (Case called)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BALSAMELLO: Good afternoon, your Honor. Frank
Balsamello for the United States. With me at counsel table is
Teddy Cohan, an intern in our office.

THE COURT: Welcome, and thank you very much.

Mr. Neuman?

MR. NEUMAN: James Neuman for Jonathan Padilla.

THE COURT: Sir, thank you very much. And Mr. Padilla, good afternoon to you, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon, your Honor. How you doing.

THE COURT: I'm doing well, sir, thank you.

Mr. Neuman, are there members of Mr. Padilla's family or friends?

MR. NEUMAN: Yes, his mother is here and his uncle.

THE COURT: Are they able to understand, generally speaking, what's happening?

MR. NEUMAN: Yes, yes.

THE COURT: Good to hear that. Thank you.

Let me please make sure I have the documents that I should have. I have a presentence investigation report that is dated July 8 of 2019. I have a defense sentencing submission that is dated August 20 of 2019, with letters from family and friends and certificates from BOP programs. And I have a government's sentencing submission that is dated September 4 of

Case 1:18-cr-00454-KPF Document 138 Filed 10/09/19 Page 3 of 49 J9B3PADS Sentence 2019. 1 Mr. Balsamello, is there anything else I should have 2 3 for the government? 4 MR. BALSAMELLO: No, your Honor. Thank you. 5 THE COURT: Mr. Neuman, is there anything else I should have for the defense? 6 7 MR. NEUMAN: No, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Let me ask a couple of 8 9 questions. More of a housekeeping nature. 10 Mr. Balsamello, has the government had a sufficient 11 opportunity under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32 to 12 review the presentence investigation report in this case? 13 MR. BALSAMELLO: Yes, we have. 14 THE COURT: I saw that there were some suggested edits from the defense that were accepted by the probation officer. 15 Were there any objections or corrections submitted by the 16 17 government? 18 MR. BALSAMELLO: The correction -- there was nothing submitted to probation. I do discuss in our submission the 19 20 discrepancy between our criminal history calculation. 21

THE COURT: We can talk about that now or later. I actually think the probation office may be correct.

MR. BALSAMELLO: Okay.

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Let's hold off on that for now. With the exception of that guidelines calculation issue, does the

government have any objections to the PSR?

MR. BALSAMELLO: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you for letting me know.

Mr. Neuman, have you and has Mr. Padilla had a sufficient opportunity under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32 to review the presentence report in this case?

MR. NEUMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have any objections to it in its current state?

MR. NEUMAN: No, we don't.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you so much.

Mr. Balsamello, then let me ask you some questions about the PSR, and then I'll ask them as well of Mr. Neuman. Is the government seeking restitution or forfeiture in this case?

MR. BALSAMELLO: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Then I will not ask you further about it.

Let's talk about the disconnect in the criminal history

category. And as I understand the probation office's view,

everybody was in agreement that no points should be assessed

for the two sentences of five years' probation, because the

conduct that underlay those sentences was relevant conduct in

this case.

We're all in agreement on that point, correct?

MR. BALSAMELLO: Yes.

THE COURT: As a result, they were not counted.

MR. BALSAMELLO: Correct.

THE COURT: The probation office says if you look at application note 4 to guideline Section 4A1.1, it says that a criminal justice sentence is a sentence that is countable under 4A1.2 that has a custodial or supervisory component.

What I understood that to mean was that if the sentence counted for points, it also, potentially, could count for this provision. And my thought was for the same reason that those two probationary terms don't count for guidelines points, it's the same reason they don't count for, if you will, criminal justice sentence points. Because, in theory, it's all related to this conduct, and I would think you could make the argument to me, and I imagine you will, that this is a case that is not about merely 17 sales to an undercover. It's as well about this 2009 conduct, and I should keep this in mind and I certainly will. But, it didn't occur to me that that made it a criminal justice sentence that could be used under Subsection D. But I will hear you in response.

MR. BALSAMELLO: I think there are two points to make in response to that. First, under Section 4A1.2, I unfortunately don't have my guidelines in front of me, but I believe there is a subsection within 4A1.2 that's actually headed sentences countable -- I believe it's counted and excluded.

THE COURT: There is indeed.

MR. BALSAMELLO: The reason that the sentence is not -- the five-year probationary sentences are not given points under 4A1.1(b) is not the reason in the counted and excluded section if I'm --

THE COURT: I will hand you mine. I'm sure you'll share with Mr. Neuman.

MR. NEUMAN: I have a copy.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. BALSAMELLO: So the Section 4A1.2(c) sentences counted and excluded lists certain categories of crimes.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BALSAMELLO: That are, for some reason, because of their nature, trespassing, driving while intoxicated. They are either counted or excluded sort of categorically because of the crime that's committed.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BALSAMELLO: So, our office's position is that when the note refers to sentences that are counted versus not counted under Section 4A1.2, that they're referring to counted and excluded, that is the terminology actually used for 4A1.2(c). That it's not a reference to any sentence for which points aren't attributed under 4A1.2 generally. It is a specific reference to things that are counted and not counted under 4A1.2(c)(1) and (2).

THE COURT: Whereas here, what you'd say is it's not 4A1.2 that excludes it. It is 1B1.3.

MR. BALSAMELLO: Correct. Correct. Because of the relevant conduct aspect here. And sort of a matter of equity or logic I guess to how this applies also.

Your Honor pointed out part of our argument will be this is long running conduct by this defendant. There had been drug distribution dating back so many years. So the conviction, the sentence back in 2009, there is a logic to not assessing points for those convictions themselves.

But there is a separate harm not accounted for anywhere in the guidelines or anywhere else in this discussion for the fact that he was doing this while under the criminal justice sentence, that he was doing this while on probation, under the supervision of court. So that is sort of an equitable matter why we think there is a reason to still assess those points. And then as a technical matter, the reading under the guidelines is that counted and excluded is a reference to these categories of crimes that are definitionally here in Subsection (c). Counted or excluded is not a reference to just anything that doesn't get points because of the relevant conduct provision, as you said, in 1B1.3.

THE COURT: Okay. Was that your second argument? You had said to me there were two arguments.

MR. BALSAMELLO: Right, it is the guideline subsection

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

point, and separately the separate harm. I think that the points are addressing the fact that there was court supervision while the conduct was ongoing that gives at least a rationale for applying those points that wouldn't apply to hitting him twice for the same conviction. Those were the two arguments.

THE COURT: I understand that. And appreciating that the parties have stipulated to a criminal history category of II, you'll understand that neither one of you will consider it a breach of an agreement if I ask for your respective positions on this position, correct?

MR. BALSAMELLO: Correct.

THE COURT: I now understand better your argument and I do appreciate that.

Let me see if there are other issues that I want to address with you before speaking more broadly about the sentence. Do you have knowledge, sir, of the criminal cases that are discussed in paragraphs 54 and 55 and, more specifically, is the one discussed in 55 also relevant conduct?

MR. BALSAMELLO: I would have to look back at the NYPD records that we have. Standing here, I don't have specific additional knowledge to add to this. Looking at just the precinct that it occurred in, if this had been a conviction and we were talking about whether there would be points for relevant conduct or whether it's part of sort of the ongoing offense that's bringing us here, I would very likely be taking

the position it is part of the same ball of conduct that gave rise to this case. It is a drug sale in immediate proximity to where this conspiracy was occurring.

I don't have the particulars on it in front of me, but it's in the conspiracy period, obviously it is very close geographically and within the precinct. So I believe that it is, but I can't say definitively.

THE COURT: Fair enough. By the same token, you are not arguing that it is something different. You are not going to argue that it is separate criminal conduct that I should consider separate from everything else in the charged conspiracy.

MR. BALSAMELLO: No. I think it is another instance of the same drug behavior that has brought the defendant here.

THE COURT: Am I correct that there is an arrest for narcotics trafficking in 2009, and then the next one is 2018?

MR. BALSAMELLO: That is -- these are his reported arrests.

THE COURT: Okay. Are there unreported arrests of which you are aware?

MR. BALSAMELLO: There -- I would have to go back to the file. But there are additional sealed arrests, absolutely. This is very common in the state. And I reference and I think it's in the PSR offense conduct section, though not listed under the arrests.

When probation does the PSR, they go by what they are able to get on rap sheets that they pull. It is extremely common in the state for an arrest to result in a conditional discharge and drug program, or be disposed of in some way that ultimately it is sealed and not reported to probation. So I believe that the total number of arrests that we were aware of was 20.

THE COURT: You're anticipating my next question.

Because I saw six or so arrests in the PSR, and I saw 20 in your submission, and I wasn't sure about the disparity.

MR. BALSAMELLO: All of the ones in between would be arrests that, for one reason or another, were ultimately sealed. Many times that means there's not a disposition reflecting guilt. Sometimes it means there is a plea, drug program, conditional discharge, plea is withdrawn. There are many different ways the state plays out cases where, ultimately, and unfortunately, at a federal sentencing we don't get a full picture of the person's arrest history.

But at the very least we're often able to get a list of the arrests, the fact that they occurred, and the very basics of where they happened within what the top charge may have been. So, there is, even just here, there was a single arrest listed in 2013, a contempt arrest for domestic violence. But I believe there were also other drug arrests between 2009 and 2018, just none of which resulted in unsealed dispositions.

MR. BALSAMELLO: And that we have, if the Court would want them, we have, I'm sure arrest reports, complaint reports, things of that nature for each one of them.

THE COURT: And therefore that I don't have.

THE COURT: But they were resolved in a sealed manner, and I don't know at this time why each one was resolved in the manner that it was. I mean, you did argue to me that there were 20 arrests and I didn't have substantiation for those arrests.

MR. BALSAMELLO: And if the Court wanted, the best we could provide in terms of substantiation would be the NYPD 61, the complaint reports and the arrest reports. There wouldn't — to the extent there would be transcripts or things of that nature, those are under seal. There would be a different process to get. But, we are aware at the very least of the occurrence of that many arrests.

THE COURT: I know you'll take this the right way. I don't have them here with me today, and no effort was made to bring them to me before now. So, I don't think it's appropriate for me to consider them. Perhaps going forward, if there are other defendants in this case for whom you think it would be illuminating of some issue for me to know about these other arrests, I should have more substantiation for them. So I don't think I am going to focus on them for this defendant.

Do you have more knowledge than what's in the PSR of

the disciplinary incidents?

MR. BALSAMELLO: No, your Honor. We simply don't get those from the bureau of prisons either. Probation has some amount of access, at least just of seeing what occurred, what the very basic nature of the offense and what the discipline was that was imposed. So, we really are limited to what probation is able to access there.

THE COURT: All right. I understand being in a place that you are not supposed to be in. I understand less interfering with the security device. That to me conjures up a whole lot of images, I don't know what it is. I'll ask Mr. Neuman, and if finance he knows, he will tell me.

Let me turn to the defense. Mr. Neuman, let me begin with a housekeeping matter. At the very back of the presentence investigation report, there are mandatory, standard and special conditions of supervised release beginning at page 24. Have you been able to review those with your client Mr. Padilla?

MR. NEUMAN: Judge, frankly, I don't think that I reviewed the conditions with my client.

THE COURT: I would like you to do that for this reason. Number one, I am going to be asking whether he is aware of them and this would be helpful. Secondly, it would be my preference, if the parties are in agreement, that I would make reference to them as the mandatory, standard and special

conditions of supervised release, and not read into the record each one of them.

So, would you like to take a moment to review them with your client?

MR. NEUMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Would you prefer I step off the bench as you do that?

MR. NEUMAN: I think we can do it, I think it would be more efficient if you remained, if you don't mind.

THE COURT: I don't want you to be rushed in your conversations with your client.

MR. NEUMAN: I won't be rushed.

THE COURT: Thank you.

(Defendant conferring with his counsel)

MR. NEUMAN: Judge, we've finished up. I think I was fast, but I believe I gave him all the essential information.

THE COURT: May I address your client directly?

MR. NEUMAN: Yes, please do.

THE COURT: Mr. Padilla, I see now that you've had an opportunity to review the mandatory, standard and special conditions of supervised release with your attorney. Were you able to do that just now?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you understand what they provided,

25 || sir?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.	
2	THE COURT: To the extent you had any followup	
3	questions or concerns, were you able to address those with your	
4	attorney?	
5	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.	
6	THE COURT: So, when I impose sentence in this case,	
7	do you agree that I may refer to these collectively as the	
8	mandatory, standard and special conditions of supervised	
9	release, without reading each of them into the record?	
10	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.	
11	THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Neuman, I presume you	
12	agree as well, sir?	
13	MR. NEUMAN: Yes, your Honor.	
14	THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Neuman, additional	
15	questions, please. Do you have any insight into the	
16	disciplinary infractions that I was discussing with the	
17	prosecutor a moment ago?	
18	MR. NEUMAN: Judge, I think the the one that	
19	involved being in an unauthorized area had to do with trying to	
20	make a phone call, if I remember. Something like that.	
21	Your Honor, may I have a moment? I'm getting	
22	corrected.	
23	THE COURT: Take whatever time you need. Thank you.	
24	(Defendant conferring with his counsel)	
	1	

MR. NEUMAN: Oh, okay. Now I'm remembering. What

25

happened is that he changed his cell without permission, which apparently is something that --

THE COURT: You can't do.

MR. NEUMAN: -- you can't do. Fairly routine, I also understand, but is not allowed. That's --

(Defendant conferring with his counsel)

MR. NEUMAN: Okay. Judge, I remember now. He was in the SHU at the time of the other infraction, and was it was Christmas Eve, he was trying to get the attention of the officer to make a phone call to tell his family they wouldn't be able to visit. And so there is a tray, kind of held on to it to get the attention of the officer. That's what it was. Put his hand in the slot.

THE DEFENDANT: And called for the lieutenant.

THE COURT: I missed -- I didn't know if you wanted him to speak.

MR. NEUMAN: I think it's okay, Judge.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, what happened was I had came to the box Christmas Eve and there was a visit the next day. So I tried to get ahold of the SHU lieutenant to see if I could call my family. They didn't want to let me get a call, so I put my hand in the slot for one minute. And the lieutenant wrote me up for that.

THE COURT: Were you able to tell your family not to come the next day?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, but I got written up.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Neuman, let's turn to the issue of the guidelines calculations. It would not surprise me if you agreed with my views rather than the prosecutor's views, but I do want to hear from you on the issue.

MR. NEUMAN: Yes, Judge. So, when I saw the report and the prosecutor's letter I tried to, I did try to research this. I didn't find case law reported on this.

THE COURT: Neither did I, yes.

MR. NEUMAN: My next step is I called the very helpful people at the guideline, I mean the U.S. guidelines commission. They have a hotline. I don't know if your Honor has used it. It's very helpful, they take questions from prosecutors, judges, lawyers. And they're terrific.

So I called them up, and they agreed with probation. Their reasoning to me is they said it's — they didn't have any cause law either. They said it is a matter of interpreting the plain language of these two guidelines, first 4A1.1D, and application note four says that basically refers you to 4A1.2 to see what sentences are counted. In other words 4A1.1(d), application note 4 has a reference there about any criminal justice sentence. So, if we go to 4A1.2, application note 1, it says prior sentence is a sentence that's essentially — I'm doing shorthand — not relevant conduct. So, in other words, they don't use the phrase "relevant conduct." They say it has

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to be counted, not otherwise excluded. So, they also said that they view that two point enhancement for probation, it can't stand alone. There has to be, they used the phrase it is not a naked enhancement. It has to be based upon something else that's countable.

So, that was the best authority I could get. It makes sense to me, but I don't have any other precedent to cite for you.

THE COURT: Of course. Thank you for letting me know. Let me see if I have additional housekeeping questions for you.

Let me turn to the government. Mr. Balsamello, if I'm not mistaken, this is the first sentencing in this case?

MR. BALSAMELLO: That's correct.

THE COURT: As a result of that, I need from both sides a little bit more insight than I currently have into the hierarchy and the nature of this charged conspiracy. looking for your assistance in that regard.

I don't know, for example, I suspect the answer is no, but I don't know if I should discern anything from Mr. Padilla's placement in the indictment, where he's located. I do not know, I'm sensing that he himself was not involved in violent activity. I'm sensing that the members of this conspiracy may not have been involved in violent activity. But, rather, their sales of drugs in this neighborhood may have fostered a climate in which others felt more comfortable use

violence.

Also, sir, his brother is in this case as well. And to the extent that one recruited the other or one supervised the other or they were just two individuals in the case of equal culpability I'd like to know that as well.

So, I appreciate your permitting me the indulgence of giving you these issues, and I'll hear anything you want to tell me, but I'd also like to know that.

MR. BALSAMELLO: Certainly, your Honor. Much of what your Honor said is correct, but I'll fill in some detail and give some color.

In terms of the structure of the indictment and the order and whether that reflects culpability or hierarchy, things of that nature, to some degree it does. There are certain ways in which it does and others in which it doesn't.

Kawain Nelson we know to have been a supplier to, among other people, James Crooms and for a time Anthony Corley who themselves supplied other people who made street-level sales, including Mr. Padilla.

Within the middle of the indictment, though, there is not much that can be gleaned from Mr. Padilla being below Mr. Hudson or above Lamar Griffin. There is not much rationale there. In many respects, what these guys were doing was fairly similar.

I'll qualify that by saying since charging the case,

we've developed a number of cooperating witnesses who have given us more insight into each person, violence, firearms, things of that nature, that now if we were to reorder the indictment may have caused certain shifts.

But in terms of the way it's structured now and the drug conspiracy aspect, from Albert Collins through the end, essentially they're street-level crack cocaine sellers, and the ways they went about doing it and some of the harms that they may have had, the effects they may have had on the neighborhood may have differed in kind, but not necessarily in gravity.

In terms of violence, we do know of several, we now know of several individuals on this indictment possessing firearms in connection with the conspiracy. We don't know of Mr. Padilla being involved in any violence himself. I say that because there may yet be a superseding indictment with some of the defendants here being charged in 924 counts. That is an aspect of the case. But you're correct in terms of some of the most serious acts of violence that occurred in this neighborhood, we know of a few discharges of firearms, robberies, burglaries by people on this indictment. Not Mr. Padilla directly.

That said, as your Honor indicated and as I probably will argue further at the appropriate point, the entire culture and nature of this community was dramatically and negatively affected by Mr. Padilla and people who even had his role in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this conspiracy in certain ways. It is interesting you mentioned his brother, because his brother I think was fairly similar in terms of their drug business, what they were doing in terms of the sales. But just as a way to sort of convey how pernicious this is and how much it sort of consumes people who are involved in this activity, Mr. Padilla's mother, there was a serious discussion about whether she would be charged in this case.

THE COURT: The woman who is behind you?

MR. BALSAMELLO: Yes. Because the apartment that they operated out of and the building they operated out of, and the way this conspiracy just infected a community, it is very easy I think when we then get to the sentencing of one person to hear that, yes, he is a drug user.

In the instance of his mother, who we ultimately did not charge, and there are more mitigating circumstances there I think, but to look at certain defendants and appreciate the circumstances in their lives that make them sympathetic when they are alone here at this sentencing. Sometimes, though, to lose sight of something the lead detective pointed out to me when I was talking to him about sentencing in this case, which was you move into an apartment building that is, as a structure, is a place to live. It is a perfectly nice There are families there. There are parents trying building. to take kids to school in this neighborhood. And you step into

the hallway, and you've got Mr. Padilla, his brother, other conspirators in this case, selling crack, heroin, left and right. With the crowds of users and addicts that come along with it, with all of the poverty and harm and ultimately violence that trails a conspiracy like this.

So, while there are sympathetic aspects certainly of probably every defendant, many defendants who come before the Court in a drug case, there's also a reason when law enforcement looks at a community, where there have been a rash of shootings, where there are routine robberies, they see who are creating the environment where those things thrive.

For a month we were intercepting Mr. Padilla's phone, so we had great insight into how many times drug customers were coming into this apartment building — this residential building where families are trying to live and go about their lives — to go get a hit off Mr. Padilla or his brother or, at times, his mother because they are not home, so they are making sales in the door.

In isolation, a single quiet crack sale in a building would not draw a federal prosecution. But in an aggregate, where a conspiracy operates for years at a time and it has such a damaging effect on the community around it, and it really does, the government believes, lead to the conditions where the shootings and robberies occur. So that is something meaningful we believe to be addressed in cases like this.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There's certainly, we recognize there is absolutely a place in every sentencing to be considering the circumstances of each defendant's life and what brought them here. But there is also the need to address what they were doing collectively in this neighborhood.

That was sort of a long diversion from the discussion about his brother. But that is sort of how many of these defendants are viewed in this case. Some of them, as I said, there will be talk of gun possession and instances of street violence and things like that as well. But that's where Mr. Padilla, even as a non-violent participant in this conspiracy, at least not violent as far as we are aware of, where we believe were the grave harm has been caused by him and the others who were with him, to the point that it even really pulls in family members who maybe on their own wouldn't be involved in selling crack cocaine hand-to-hand, but it consumes the defendants themselves and it consumes really so many people who are living around them just trying to live law-abiding lives.

If the Court has any other questions with respect to the conspiracy itself, I'm happy to address them.

THE COURT: I don't believe so. I'll hear you more generally on sentencing. Thank you.

> MR. BALSAMELLO: Sure.

THE COURT: Let me be more precise. It is my

1 preference that you not r

preference that you not rest on your submission. So, if you have told me everything you want to tell me, including the answering of my questions, then certainly sit down. But if there are things you'd like to highlight in your written sentencing submission or other things you'd like to call to my attention, I do want to give that you opportunity.

MR. BALSAMELLO: There are some others. I won't repeat things I just said.

Turning to Mr. Padilla specifically, because I was mostly responding to sort of the structure of the conspiracy question and the harm they caused generally.

Mr. Padilla, as his criminal history reflects, has been involved in selling drugs in his community for many years. Regardless of how that's calculated under the sentencing guidelines, he has done it while on probation, after being sentenced by a court for the same conduct. He's been arrested a multitude of times, he's gotten in trouble while he's been in federal custody.

For those reasons, especially, again, I come back again to a conversation I had with the lead detective on the case who did much of the surveillance and who oversaw the controlled buys. I was talking to him about what our positions would be at certain sentencings. And he started to describe again just the -- the things that's hard to capture in a courtroom or in a sentencing submission or in any way when

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we're removed from the community where this stuff happens. crowds of people that form. The groups that go to make these buys, the groups that are selling. The shouting back and forth about who's got product where. Bringing each other into sales when they don't have product. In many respects, several of this defendant's buys, he either had product on hand when he was contacted by the undercover. He typically had product. Ιf he didn't, he knew right where to go, and there was a co-conspirator to go to.

The amount of traffic and the economy created in a community by the day-to-day hand-to-hand drug sales that, again, in isolation can seem like they're not the most serious thing in the world if you look at a single instance or a couple of instances of a drug sale to a customer. When you think about it day after day, hour after hour, for years at a time, I think that's something that the law enforcement folks we work with before we charge cases, that's what they're seeing and hearing when they are talking about who we should charge and why.

It was helpful for me to remember, even going into a sentencing like this where it is drug conduct, admittedly we are not talking about someone who shot someone himself or who was running around with a gun, causing that kind of harm. it's helpful to remember the source of harms and the ways that this kind of drug conspiracy creates the environment where

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

those other things do happen and where it becomes accepted and commonplace for kids to be around, amidst crack is cooking in this apartment. Customers over here. Dope customers there. It's constant and it goes on for a long time with a lot of people. So Mr. Padilla was certainly one of them. From hearing his phone, this was his business. This was how he It was the way he supported himself. And part of supporting himself was supporting his own use.

So, we know full well that he knows the harm that comes with being a drug user. But he was perpetuating those harms too.

We do think it is important to deter others in that community who know there was a federal case that came out of this. So they see there is a real consequence to a federal drug prosecution. Often in the state there aren't consequences for drug cases. And if anything, they're moving in a direction of there being fewer consequences.

THE COURT: Just one moment, please. Let me probe this a little bit. You are speaking now general deterrence and Do you perceive that there is a deterrent, this I understand. an incremental deterrence between the mandatory minimum sentence that applies here, the guidelines range that the probation office calculated, and the guidelines range that is calculated in the government's plea agreement?

MR. BALSAMELLO: I think there is something

1 incremental, and I think there are other important reasons.

can be given will be given.

The distinction between the minimum where the Court would be telling the defendant you get the lowest thing I am allowed to give you versus the guideline ranges that are at issue. I think the guideline ranges themselves, there is a nine-month overlap between them. There is not a tremendous difference between what we had agreed to and what probation calculates, so I think there's a sentence in that area that's — there may not be a dramatic difference in terms of general deterrence between 72 and 78 months. But I do think there is something meaningful in terms of a message of the minimum. The lowest thing that

I think for there to be a sentence above the mandatory minimum I do think has some additional deterrent value. We've actually, in connection with this case, there is a sort of companion case that we're prosecuting before Judge Swain where we searched some cell phones of some guys who had been supplying drug dealers in the same area. We saw a text message from one brother to another with the press release from this arrest and a discussion about Feds are coming, they ain't playing. Because of a case like this.

So that doesn't mean that Mr. Padilla is the most culpable of the murderers that have operated there or the highest level drug suppliers, but, it does mean that people in that community, and especially people who are involved in this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

very criminal activity, know when 10 or 12 or 15 of their associates get taken at the same time, and then what happens to them.

Very often, state prosecutions, they're back very quickly. And I think that sometimes that's how we end up with cases where someone's arrested 10 and more times, because it can be there never is that message that there is a consequence.

So we do believe that a sentence we think in our negotiated range is appropriate to accomplish that goal. I think for the same sort of reasons respect for the law is implicated here. I think there is a need to specifically deter Mr. Padilla who has been in trouble before. Even if they've been sort of minor disciplinary infractions, even while at the MCC he's been defiant and sort of resisted authority in a way that the Court should consider at least to some degree.

I think the overriding thing, though, that those who have worked on this case and the government generally I think wants to accomplish with this is to protect the community from Mr. Padilla and from the broader, again, the broader conspiracy that existed here. That if he and any number of these defendants are back within a couple years, it will be the same thing again is a very real concern. As it has happened before when he's had cases before and is back, and the same conduct continues.

So given those objectives of sentencing under Section

3553(a), they're both accomplished with a sentence within the range that we've negotiated in the plea agreement.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

MR. BALSAMELLO: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Neuman, I'll hear from you now, sir.

And you are welcome to respond to the issues that I've been discussing with Mr. Balsamello. For you in particular, I think I'd like to understand what plans your client has for reentry into the community. There was I think a miscommunication with his niece, not about where he would be living, but, if indeed he's had a number of arrests and several of them have been for narcotics sales, it's not clear to me why this one differs. So I'll hear from you on anything you'd like to speak about, but I'd like you to focus on those things too.

MR. NEUMAN: Okay. I'll try to go somewhat sequentially here.

THE COURT: Of course.

MR. NEUMAN: Judge, we're not here to doubt the scourge of drugs in the neighborhood. Nobody disputes that. But I think it's clear from the prosecutor's presentation, Mr. Padilla is a street-level drug dealer and he's an addict. And he has been for a long time, and he's been committing, he's been selling drugs and using them for a long time. And he sells to support his habit. We admit that. He is not by any stretch any kind of manager or organizer, did not enlist his

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

brother to do these crimes. I'm told they don't even get There is no hint in what I've seen that he has along. committed any violence in connection with these crimes. Ιt sounds to me like he is as low level as they come. distinction being it's been going on for a while, and that's true. We do acknowledge that.

But, the government mentioned about how it's sometimes hard to convey something in a sentencing memo. Well, what I really want to convey is the kind of person that Mr. Padilla is. What I have seen personally when I've represented him, been representing him, is a person who has been struggling with, trying to find a balance between taking responsibility for himself, and using drugs, and medicine, and relying on other people. And let me break that down. It goes into his history.

I've detailed how at a young age he was diagnosed with various conditions. ADD, bipolar, anxiety, depression. mother just mentioned to me before court that her recollection, he was actually once diagnosed as schizophrenic, which I did not know. And during those years, he received some counseling and some medication. But I think that from speaking to the family and Mr. Padilla personally, it sounds like they didn't really get the medication right. Sometimes it had a bad effect. His family told me just recently that it made him less responsive and he didn't like the medicine, and then would go

off of it, and self-medicated with opiates, which he became severely addicted to.

what I see also though is he's trying to take -- by not taking the medicine, it is actually a form of -- I think it is taking responsibility for himself. It was a misguided thing. He is trying to do it by himself. This also has come up during his time while this case has been pending. I believe he's not been taking the medication offered at the MDC. I'm not sure that they offer all of the options that you might get on the outside.

What he has done is put himself through a really incredible regimen of physical fitness, and has transformed himself. This is, to me, very, very significant because I know how closely it is tied to self-esteem.

When he was a kid, 13, I think he said, he weighed about 200 pounds. And this is something that he struggled with for decades and affected his image, and he did have very low self-esteem. And in the past few years, he has decided he's going to take responsibility for that.

I know this might sound trivial to some people, but it's not to me. I know the effect of physical health. And when you're able to lose something like 150 pounds, and become really in peak shape, this is not something that's common in prison. They all have time to exercise. They don't do this. When you do that, it gives you a sense of pride and

accomplishment.

And when I've talked to him in recent months, he does have a plan about what he wants to do. He wants to get a GED. He's been asking for tutoring from other inmates on math because he struggles with that. He's taken it a number of times, but he's failing, but he's determined to get it. He wants to get a commercial driver's license because he knows that's a good plan. He's told me when he gets transferred to a halfway house, he's got an idea. He is going to work as many hours as he can work, and he does have a history of that, even while he was committing those crimes he was at least for a couple of years employed full-time. He's planning to save every cent so when he gets out, he can put a deposit down and get his own place.

Now, I can also say I spoke to his family about what was mentioned about this niece not wanting — that I found it odd. Probation spoke to one particular person and got that information. Maybe they weren't, maybe when others were not around. He did not speak to his mother, did not speak to another niece, and his uncle who is here, and other people have told me there is a place for him when he gets out. If he needs a place, they will put, they will gladly have him. So, okay, one niece did not want him to be there. And I understand that, she's got children. Mr. Padilla has a long history of drug abuse. It's completely natural that she wouldn't want him

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

there, even though she obviously loves him at the same time. But it is not true to say he doesn't have a place to go. does have a place to go, he's got a lot of support from his And in any event, what he wants to do is he wants to get his -- he does want to get his own place in a different neighborhood from where he grew up. He wants to continue with his fitness regimen. He thinks he can get some part-time work doing that. That's not really his long employment goal. It is more a passion for him at this point.

Another thing that's important is he is determined to reestablish relationship with his daughter. And you may recall from my memo that he had a longterm relationship with the girlfriend, the daughter was born in 2012, they were together, Mr. Padilla was supporting both the girlfriend and the daughter for about three or four years when they lived together. they broke up, which was a very upsetting experience for my client. He continued to support his daughter. He asked the Court for visitation, was granted it. The daughter would come around on the weekends.

Now, while he has been in here, I think recently he has been served with papers where I think his girlfriend is trying to interfere with his rights or limit them in some way. Full custodial rights. This is something that I'm trying to help my client with. He's very concerned about it. He wants to fight that, which is difficult.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But, my point here is that his plan is to be a father when he gets out. His plan is to work full-time. His plan is to get a GED. His plan is to start as a dishwasher, but move And I think that for the first time in his life, he has a sense that he has the ability to do these things.

(Defendant conferring with his counsel)

MR. NEUMAN: My client is just reminding me he would like a chance to speak when this is done.

THE COURT: Of course.

MR. NEUMAN: So I'll make sure he will have that opportunity. My client has told me he thinks this arrest has saved his life. That is not something I hear from most people. I believe it. I believe he is sincere when he tells me this. He knows how terrible drugs are. He has no intention of going back to this. While he's been arrested many times, it's true, he's never served a sentence anywhere close to this. was it -- I am not sure even more than a few months.

THE DEFENDANT: I did 18 months.

MR. NEUMAN: 18 months as a juvenile in a juvenile facility. That was it.

As far as specific deterrence is concerned, I can tell you, the difference between the minimum 60 months, what I'm talking about, and something in the 70s, that's not going to have any impact on my client about whether he is going to do this kind of behavior again. Five years is plenty to persuade

him this is not a good thing.

I will also say I find it quite implausible that anybody on the street is going to think, well, this guy, he got five years, but he could have gotten six or seven years and that's somehow going to be an incentive or not a deterrent to them. I don't think that's the way people work. The government was adamant that he receive a (b)(1)(B). Five-year minimum. That's a deterrent, Judge.

It would be one thing if he were here and he was facing a (b)(1)(C) and we would be talking about whether he should get two years or something like that. But we're not talking about that. Nobody is suggesting that someone in Mr. Padilla's position be let out in a couple of years. It so happens he's been in jail for a couple of years already, but it is a five-year minimum sentence. That's substantial for someone who is an addict and has had a lot of problems, and he's working through them and I do see first hand someone who has growing self-esteem. And I think that if he's under proper supervision, and by that I mean, he's given a program when he gets out — and incidentally, he wants very much to attend a residential drug treatment program while he's in, something he specifically asked me to ask your Honor to recommend.

I think that he recognizes that he does have some psychological issues that need some kind of counseling. And I hope in the future that we can find a proper balance of

medicine. That's not always easy to do. But, he knows he needs help. He doesn't -- he wants to be there for his daughter, and he's not going to do this again. And I think I've covered everything. If you have anything else I can respond to.

THE COURT: I have no specific questions. Thank you very much.

Mr. Padilla, at this time I understand you'd like to speak and I invite you to do so. I do want you to be aware you are not obligated to speak with me, but if you wish to do so, I will take very seriously all you will say.

What I will ask you, sir, just because of the acoustics in this courtroom, if you could please speak a little louder and a little slower than you might otherwise in your conversations with others, because I want to make sure everyone in this courtroom, including the folks in the gallery, hear from you. Thank you, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm not coming here with like a letter written to tell you something that you heard a million times before. I made a lot of mistakes in my life, constantly doing the same thing, going back to jail and coming back out, because I had a fear of hopelessness and failure. When a person goes to jail and they come out and they have a record, they feel

1 like they can't do nothing better but that same exact thing.

can't do none of this, because I already went to jail. I have

Because they feel like I can't get a job, I can't do this, I

a felony. So it's that doubt in the back of your mind that

gives you that, that thought where you set yourself up for

6 failure.

So it was like now that I been here, I got a chance to rehabilitate myself physically and mentally and know that there's hope, and this is not the end of the road. I know I can come out and do other things to better myself and better my life.

I would like to apologize to my family, to the families that I destroyed selling them the drugs, and my daughter as well, because she's seven years old and she's not getting no younger and I'm not getting no younger. I'm getting older. I'm 30 years old now. I been selfish to myself, leaving my kid behind, coming to jail behind and being a disappointment.

And I do say at this stage in my life, because I got hit by the Mack truck this time. Maybe before I went to the state, I got a little locked up in Rikers for five, five months, it wasn't a bad penalty. Now I can see how serious things can get, and I got to sit here and really think and be around people that I'm around every single day in here that got 30, 40 years, and may not got a chance to come home again. So

J9B3PADS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I got to see things from a different light.

Not that I'm coming here for a pity party from any of I am coming to tell you how I feel honestly as a man. And you know, like, my mental health states and my depression and anxiety all the stuff that I dealt with my whole life, I found other ways, like exercise, music, books, and other things to try to cope with things. I feel like pills and drugs ain't the solution to everything. I was taking Xanax when I was home from my psychiatrist and other type of mental health medications that was stabilizing me, but it wasn't stabilizing It was a super hero pill that I was taking that was just narrowing me out. So as to the point where I'm high, so of course, nothing's bothering me. So I'm getting a case of "F it," you know what I mean, everything doesn't matter.

But now I got the chance to really clear my mind and look at things and see what's more important and more valuable. And this is not it. Whether you guys want to believe me or not, or he wants to paint the picture however he wants to paint it, that's cool. I am not here to tell anybody how to do their job.

All I'm telling you, ma'am, I am coming here to talk to you as an adult to tell you this is sincerity in my voice. I got to see things from a different light. I just hope whatever decision you make today, you make the right one. a blessed day.

THE COURT: Mr. Padilla, Mr. Neuman may have told you this. If not, I will tell you that, unlike most judges in this district, I take a break between hearing from everybody and imposing sentence. And the reason I do that is because I do not come to this proceeding with a sentence already in mind. It is very important for me to keep an open mind until I've heard from everyone, and you are the last, and on many levels, the most important person from whom I hear.

I am going to ask for your patience while I step off the bench and gather my notes together, because I want to make sure again that I have a moment to think clearly about everything I've heard today and about everything I've read in preparation for this sentence.

Mr. Balsamello, is there something you wish to add?

MR. BALSAMELLO: May I respond briefly to something

Mr. Neuman said?

THE COURT: You may sir, yes.

MR. BALSAMELLO: Something I think worth considering is the degree to which five years — he is saying five years is not we are not (b)(1)(C) world where we're talking two or three, but five years is not actually five years, and Mr. Neuman highlighted two ways that it's not: The residential drug program and the halfway house. Both of those together could result in Mr. Padilla doing considerably less than five years if he's given a five-year sentence. And that is

something that we know from talking to cooperators, people in the street do notice. That cooperating witnesses in a case are still sitting in and hearing that someone is getting out a year later because they are going to go to the halfway house and they've done the drug program. Five years is not a full 60 months in terms of time spent incarcerated, and from speaking with witnesses and people who have been involved in conspiracies like this, I know they do notice how long people are aware for. That five versus six versus seven is, we believe, material.

THE COURT: Again, just to probe this issue a little bit further. One has to complete successfully the RDAP program before one gets any break on their sentence. Is that not correct?

MR. BALSAMELLO: I believe that's correct.

THE COURT: Right. So recommending, if indeed I do recommend, Mr. Padilla for this program, that that's not what guarantees him any shortening of his sentence. It is his work, his successful work, if indeed he is successful, that results in the reduction of the sentence. Also correct?

MR. BALSAMELLO: That's fair. It is a degree to which the punishment for the crime, though, is mitigated by something he then does after the fact. And the halfway house is another way that the sentence is augmented a bit in a way that I think people do realize, in a way that affects the general deterrent

1 effect of it.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BALSAMELLO: Thank you.

THE COURT: I've taken the note. Thank you.

Mr. Neuman, as you can tell from -- well, you have heard my discussion with Mr. Balsamello. I think I do understand both sides of the issue, but if you or your client wish to be heard on that one point, I'll hear from you.

MR. NEUMAN: No, Judge. I think I said everything.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. I'll be back as soon as I can. If it's possible for the marshals to allow Mr. Padilla to speak with his family members, I would appreciate it. Thank you.

(Recess)

(In open court)

THE COURT: What I'm going to do now is outline the sentence that I intend to impose, and then I will give each side an opportunity to make legal objections before I actually impose sentence.

We've spoken a lot this afternoon about the factors that are set forth in Section 3553(a) of Title 18 of the United States Code, and the ones that I focused on this afternoon are as follows: The nature and circumstances of the offense, the history and characteristics of Mr. Padilla, the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to

promote respect for the law, to provide a just punishment for the offense, to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, to protect the public from further crimes by Mr. Padilla, to provide him with needed educational and vocational training, medical care or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner. I must consider the sentencing guidelines, and I'll speak about them momentarily, and I must consider the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among similarly situated defendants.

So, I ultimately agree with the probation office's calculation of the guidelines in this case. The base offense level is 30, and there is a three-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility, yielding an adjusted offense level of 27. But I read, as apparently the guidelines or sentencing commission hotline does, recognizing the merit and the thoughtfulness of Mr. Balsamello's position, I feel more comfortable finding that it is not countable. I agree it could have been drafted better. But in all candor, it wouldn't make a difference, because I would impose the same sentence that I'm about to impose, irrespective of whether I found Mr. Padilla to be in criminal history category II or I.

In this case, however, I find that he has no criminal history points and that he is in criminal history category I, and that the resulting guidelines range is 70 to 87 months.

I appreciate very much the efforts on both sides to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

give me a more complete picture regarding Mr. Padilla, and I want to just ask something beforehand regarding a possible correction to the PSR that I meant to mention at the beginning. If I could ask the parties to look please at paragraph number eight, I think this is a tiny little glitch, but it suggests that the sanctions imposed for Mr. Padilla being in an authorized area, which would be a strange thing indeed. just, just because someone at the BOP may read this report and do something with it, is there any objection to my correcting it to make it "unauthorized area"?

MR. BALSAMELLO: No, your Honor.

MR. NEUMAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Again, I am not being glib here, but I don't know how folks at BOP read those documents, so it might as well be accurate.

Let me move from that housekeeping measure and turn to the very important issue of Mr. Padilla's sentencing. As in many cases, and as I expect with other defendants in this case, there are very good and very bad and very sympathetic qualities to Mr. Padilla. I do appreciate the improvements that he has made to himself mentally and physically while incarcerated. appreciate the fact that he, with the assistance of his counsel, has worked on a plan for reentry into society. appreciate the fact that he has been addressing certain mental health and issues that he has had. And I think I understand

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

why he might forgo medication in favor of healthier living, or, as he said I believe, exercise and music and reading. And I hope and I know he does, too, that someday he passes the GED and actually has that, because I think that will open up more employment opportunities for him.

On the other side of the scales is the amount of time that he was involved in this conspiracy, and the sheer number of transactions in which he was involved and the fact that it's nearly nine years. And even he realizes the harm that he and others have done to the neighborhood.

I begin at the guidelines range of 70 to 87 months. suppose I begin as well as another quidepost with the mandatory minimum term of 60 months. And ultimately, I've decided to impose a term of 66 months' imprisonment. I do think there needs to be more than the bare minimum mandatory minimum. I also don't think that a 70-month sentence is necessary, and I think that there are things that Mr. Padilla has done in prison that warrant my recognizing this in terms of sentencing, and I therefore do.

So just on the point, on the discussion that I was having at the very end with Mr. Balsamello, it may be that Mr. Padilla completes successfully the RDAP program and that gets him additional time off his sentence. It may be that he qualifies for halfway house treatment at some point in the very late stage of his sentencing. In those regards, however, his

destiny is in his own hands, and it is up to him to complete the program. One does not go into the program and then get time off. He has to do something. He has to go through 500 hours I believe of the program.

So, I am willing to let Mr. Padilla put his fate in his own hands for those things, and if it turns out that results in additional reductions in his sentence, then so be it.

But I'm imposing a term of 66 months' imprisonment, and I'm ordering that term be followed by a term of supervised release of three years with the mandatory, standard and special conditions that have been outlined in the presentence investigation report.

I am not imposing a fine. I am not imposing restitution. I'm not ordering forfeiture. But I am obligated to impose a \$100 mandatory special assessment.

Mr. Balsamello, is there any reason why I may not impose this sentence?

MR. BALSAMELLO: I think, your Honor, under Section (b)(1)(B) it is actually a mandatory four years.

THE COURT: You are exactly right and thank you. Yes. In recent sentencings involving your office, folks have gone to the (b)(1)(C) level, and I think that was the note I had in my mind.

It will be four years of supervised release. Thank

1 | you for that.

Other than that, sir, is there any reason why I may not impose this sentence?

MR. BALSAMELLO: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Neuman, with that correction, this does have to be four years, sir. Is there any reason why I may not impose this sentence?

MR. NEUMAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Padilla, please rise.

Mr. Padilla, after considering all of the sentencing factors set forth in Section 3553(a) of Title 18 of the United States Code, I find that a term of 66 months' imprisonment is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with all of the purposes of sentencing. I will order that term of imprisonment be follow by a term of four years of supervised release with the mandatory, standard and special conditions that are set forth in the presentence report. I will not impose a fine or restitution or forfeiture, but I must impose a \$100 mandatory special assessment.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sir, please be seated. Thank you.

Mr. Neuman, you've asked for and I will grant the recommendation or the request that, as BOP deems appropriate, that Mr. Padilla be placed in a residential drug abuse program.

Is there a further recommendation that you'd like me to make regarding place of designation?

MR. NEUMAN: Yes.

THE DEFENDANT: Danbury --

MR. NEUMAN: So Judge, I'm not sure if you'd like to get this specific. My client's preferences are Danbury or Fort Dix. I usually simply ask for as close as possible to New York City, and I know his priority, it has to be a place that does offer that residential drug treatment program.

THE COURT: That's fine. I have in the past recommended or asked for specific places, recommended specific places, and I don't mind doing that here. What I was told by the bureau of prisons is that I should have a fallback position if it turns out those facilities do not have the requested space, because otherwise, the defendant will end up anywhere they have space, which could be a different coast.

MR. NEUMAN: That's my concern. Perhaps you could say either Fort Dix or Danbury, or if that doesn't work, a facility close to New York City.

THE COURT: That is exactly the way we will phrase it. Danbury and Fort Dix, and failing those, a facility that offers an RDAP program in the New York City metropolitan area, as close to it as possible.

MR. NEUMAN: Perfect.

THE COURT: We'll do that.

J9B3PAL

Let me have your attention for just one moment. I'm advised there may be another hiccup in the PSR. My deputy, who reads these documents with great care, reminds me that even the probation officer had some confusion about whether the appropriate range was 70 to 87 month or 78 to 97 months. So, given, as you can see on page 22 of the PSR, she finds criminal history category II, even though throughout the rest of the PSR she has found it as criminal history category I. So I'm going to find and I will therefore make corrections to those portions of the PSR that recite a criminal history category of II, and that it be 70 to 87 months.

Mr. Balsamello, any disagreement with that?

MR. BALSAMELLO: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Neuman, any disagreement?

MR. NEUMAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Padilla, to the extent that you have not waived this in any agreement that you may have with the government, you have the right to appeal from your conviction and from your sentence. If you're interested in appeal, please speak with Mr. Neuman at your earliest opportunity, because, generally speaking, you have two weeks from the date that I file the written judgment of conviction to file a notice of appeal. And my expectation is that I will be filing the judgment some time tomorrow. So if appeal is something in which you're interested, please discuss it with Mr. Neuman. Do

1 you understand that, sir?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Balsamello, I don't know if there are underlying charges instruments that require dismissal. Are there?

MR. BALSAMELLO: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sir, let me ask you, is there anything else we should be addressing?

MR. BALSAMELLO: Not from the government.

THE COURT: Mr. Neuman, anything else we should be addressing?

MR. NEUMAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: May I address your client directly, sir?

MR. NEUMAN: Please do.

THE COURT: Mr. Padilla, I want you to understand you've been very well represented in this case, and I accept what you've said to me, which is this experience has been just very different from your prior state court experiences. I'm sure you understand that the very last thing that you want to do is to see me again in this context.

So I wish you well in completing your sentence. I hope your daughter is able to see you more frequently. I hope that you're able to put in place the plans we've been talking about this afternoon. And it is my hope, and I know you will take no offense at this, that you and I not see each other in

this setting again, because if we do it means you have violated the terms of supervised release, and I can assure you that any leniency that I've shown you this afternoon, I will not show you again.

So I wish you well, sir, even if this means this is our last time seeing each other today.

With that, we are adjourned. Thank you very much.

(Adjourned)